



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,181	08/31/2004	Ira Liao	VIAP0128USA	5180
27765	7590	09/01/2005	EXAMINER	
NORTH AMERICA INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY CORPORATION			HSU, JONI	
P.O. BOX 506			ART UNIT	
MERRIFIELD, VA 22116			PAPER NUMBER	
			2671	

DATE MAILED: 09/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 10/711,181	Applicant(s) LIAO ET AL	
	Examiner Joni Hsu	Art Unit 2671	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by MacInnis (US006573905B1).

3. With regard to Claim 1, MacInnis describes a graphics card (10, Figure 1; *graphics display system contained in an integrated circuit 10*, Col. 5, lines 8-10) for smoothing the playing of video (*clock switching may be done without causing glitches on the display side*, Col. 29, lines 64-66). The graphics card includes inputs (12, Figure 1) for receiving video signals (14; Col. 5, lines 10-11), as shown in Figure 1, and also shown in Figure 2 as digital video in which is input to the mux (Col. 5, lines 54-56), and therefore the graphics card must inherently have a video capture engine for receiving the digital video signal. A video scaler (52) is connected to the video capture engine, as shown in Figure 2, and a memory (28, Figure 1) is connected to the video scaler for storing the digital signal captured by the video capture engine (*video scaler downscales before capturing video frames to memory*, Col. 6, lines 16-17); a video display engine (58, Figure 2) connected to the memory for receiving the digital signal stored in

Art Unit: 2671

the memory (*display engine 58 takes graphics information from memory and processes it for display*, Col. 7, lines 3-4); and a first clock generator connected to the video capture engine and the video display engine for providing the same clock to the video capture engine and the video display engine so as to synchronize the signal receiving rates of the video capture engine and the video display engine (*video input which runs nominally at 13.5 MHZ is synchronized with the display clock which runs nominally at 13.5 MHZ at the output*, Col. 11, lines 59-67).

4. With regard to Claim 2, MacInnis describes a decoder (50, Figure 2) connected to the mux which receives digital video in inherently from the video capture engine (Col. 5, lines 46-56), as shown in Figure 2. The decoder is for transforming a received analog video signal into the digital video signal (*video decoder digitizes and processes analog input video*, Col. 5, lines 64-67) and outputting the digital video signal to the mux, as shown in Figure 2, which is inherently connected to the video capture engine.

5. With regard to Claim 3, MacInnis describes that the first clock generator is located in the decoder (50; Col. 11, lines 59-64; Col. 37, lines 8-17).

6. With regard to Claim 4, MacInnis describes an encoder (62, Figure 2) connected to the video compositor (60; *video encoder 62 encodes the blended video output from the video compositor*, Col. 7, lines 20-25), which is connected to the video display engine (58; Col. 7, lines 3-20).

7. With regard to Claim 5, MacInnis describes that the first clock generator is further connected to the encoder (62, Figure 2) for providing the same clock to the video capture engine, the video display engine (58) (Col. 11, lines 59-64), and the encoder (*samples taken for YUV are synchronized to a display clock for compositing with graphics data at the video compositor*, Col. 34, lines 36-38; *video encoder 62 encodes the blended video output from the video compositor*, Col. 7, lines 20-25).

8. With regard to Claim 6, MacInnis describes that the encoder (62, Figure 2) is a TV encoder (HDTV encoding, Col. 86, lines 66-67).

9. Thus, it reasonably appears that MacInnis describes or discloses every element of Claims 1-6 and therefore anticipates the claims subject.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

12. Claims 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacInnis (US006573905B1) in view of Chih (US006535217B1).

13. With regard to Claim 7, MacInnis is relied upon for the teachings as discussed above relative to Claim 1.

However, MacInnis does not specifically teach an output interface connected to the video display engine for outputting the digital video from the video display engine. However, Chih describes an output interface (24, Figure 1) connected to the video display engine (22) for outputting the digital video from the video display engine (*LCD display interface 24 that receives the digital video data from the display engine 22*, Col. 4, lines 19-24).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to modify the device of MacInnis to include an output interface connected to the video display engine for outputting the digital video from the video display engine as suggested by Chih because Chih suggests that an interface is needed to provide a high rate of data transmission and provide transmission capabilities that are reliable and also do not interfere with other elements internal to and external to the computing system (Col. 1, lines 21-27).

14. With regard to Claim 9, MacInnis does not teach that the output interface is a liquid crystal display output (LCD) interface. However, Chih describes that the output interface (24, Figure 1) is a LCD output interface (Col. 4, lines 19-24).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to modify the device of as MacInnis so that the output interface is a liquid crystal display output (LCD) interface as suggested by Chih because Chih suggests that interfaces are especially needed for LCD's because the data rates required to adequately drive an LCD display are very high. When this data is transmitted in a digital fashion, the high-speed switching of the signal lines can result in electromagnetic interference that can have detrimental effects on other portions of the system, and therefore an interface is needed to meet these transmission needs (Col. 1, lines 21-34).

15. Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacInnis (US006573905B1) in view of Van Hook (US006867781B1).

16. With regard to Claim 7, MacInnis is relied upon for the teachings as discussed above relative to Claim 1.

However, MacInnis does not specifically teach an output interface connected to the video display engine for outputting the digital video from the video display engine. However, Van Hook describes an output interface (164, Figure 4) connected to the video display engine (180, 114) for outputting the digital video from the video display engine (*output of graphics pipeline*

*180 is read each frame by display/video interface unit 164, display controller/video interface 164 provides digital RGB pixel values for display*, Col. 7, lines 58-62). This would be obvious for the same reasons given in Chih, as discussed above.

17. With regard to Claim 8, MacInnis describes that the first clock generator provides the same clock to the video capture engine and the video display engine (58; Col. 11, lines 59-64).

However, MacInnis does not teach that the first clock generator is further connected to the output interface for also providing the same clock to the output interface. However, Van Hook describes providing a mechanism to synchronize the video display engine (114, Figure 4) and the output interface (164) (Col. 7, line 63-Col. 8, line 5), and therefore Van Hook inherently discloses a first clock generator that is connected to the output interface for providing the same clock to the video display engine and the output interface.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify the device of MacInnis so that the first clock generator is further connected to the output interface for also providing the same clock to the output interface as suggested by Van Hook because Van Hook suggests that it is often desirable to synchronize these different stages of the rendering system to establish time-coherence between various operations. For example, it would be very useful for the graphics command producer to know under certain circumstances when the graphics processor has finished processing a given graphics command (Col. 1, lines 47-63). Synchronizing these components allows for various programming model with different levels of complexity (Col. 7, line 63-Col. 8, line 5).



18. Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacInnis (US006573905B1) in view of Christopher (US006900845B1).

19. With regard to Claim 10, MacInnis is relied upon for the teachings as discussed above relative to Claim 1.

However, MacInnis does not teach a video process engine connected to the memory for processing the digital video signal of the memory into digital video data and then storing the digital video data in the memory. However, Christopher describes a video process engine (28, 30, 16, Figure 2A) connected to the memory (20) for processing the digital video signal of the memory into digital video data and then storing the digital video data in the memory (Col. 1, line 66-Col. 2, line 6; *compressed input video data is retrieved from external memory 20 for initial decompression, secondary compression of decompressed MPEG2 video data before complete frames are stored in memory 20*, Col. 4, lines 23-35). According to the disclosure of this application, the video process engine accesses the digital video signal from the memory to enlarge the video shrink the video, or perform other video effects on the video based on the digital video signal, and then generates digital video data and stores the digital video data in the memory [Para 13].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to modify the device of MacInnis to include a video process engine connected to the memory for processing the digital video signal of the memory into digital video data and then storing the digital video data in the memory as suggested by Christopher because Christopher

suggests that this method efficiently handles both MPEG2 format data and non-MPEG2 format data in a manner that uses memory efficiently (Col. 1, line 46-Col. 2, line 6).

20. With regard to Claim 11, MacInnis does not teach a video process clock generator connected to the video process engine for providing a clock to the video process engine. However, Christopher describes a video process clock generator connected to the video process engine (28, 30, 16, Figure 2A) for providing a clock to the video process engine (Col. 6, lines 40-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to modify the device of MacInnis to include a video process clock generator connected to the video process engine for providing a clock to the video process engine as suggested by Christopher because Christopher suggests that the video process engine must synchronize with the memory to achieve the desired bandwidth (Col. 6, lines 40-45).

21. Claims 12-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacInnis (US006573905B1) in view of Kim (US006738417B1).

22. With regard to Claim 12, MacInnis describes a graphics card (10, Figure 1; *graphics display system contained in an integrated circuit 10*, Col. 5, lines 8-10) for smoothing the playing of video (*clock switching may be done without causing glitches on the display side*, Col. 29, lines 64-66). The graphics card includes inputs (12, Figure 1) for receiving video signals (14; Col. 5, lines 10-11), as shown in Figure 1, and also shown in Figure 2 as digital video in

which is input to the mux (Col. 5, lines 54-56), and therefore the graphics card must inherently have a video capture engine for receiving the digital video signal. A video scaler (52) is connected to the video capture engine, as shown in Figure 2, and a memory (28, Figure 1) is connected to the video scaler for storing the digital signal captured by the video capture engine (*video scaler downscales before capturing video frames to memory*, Col. 6, lines 16-17); a video display engine (58, Figure 2) connected to the memory for receiving the digital signal stored in the memory (*display engine 58 takes graphics information from memory and processes it for display*, Col. 7, lines 3-4); a first clock generator connected to the video capture engine for providing a first clock to the video capture engine; and a second clock generator connected to the first clock generator to generate a second clock, the second clock having substantially the same frequency as the first clock and being offset from the first clock by a predetermined phase difference (Col. 11, line 59-Col. 12, line 4).

However, MacInnis does not teach a multiplexer having an output connected to the video display engine; and that the first clock generator is connected to a first input of the multiplexer for providing a first clock to the first input of the multiplexer; and that the second clock generator is connected to a second input of the multiplexer. However, Kim describes a multiplexer (33, Figure 7) having an output connected to the video display engine (graphics controller); and that the first clock generator (external oscillator clock) is connected to a first input of the multiplexer for providing a first clock to the first input of the multiplexer; and that the second clock generator (pixel clock) is connected to a second input of the multiplexer (Col. 4, lines 44-53), the second clock having substantially the same frequency as the first clock and being offset from the first clock by a predetermined phase difference (Col. 4, lines 61-64).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to modify the device of MacInnis to include a multiplexer having an output connected to the video display engine; and that the first clock generator is connected to a first input of the multiplexer for providing a first clock to the first input of the multiplexer; and that the second clock generator is connected to a second input of the multiplexer as suggested by Kim because Kim suggests that a multiplexer is needed to switch the clocks used in order to absorb the jitter (Col. 4, lines 61-64).

23. With regard to Claim 13, Claim 13 is similar in scope to Claim 2, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

24. With regard to Claim 14, Claim 14 is similar in scope to Claim 3, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

25. With regard to Claim 15, Claim 15 is similar in scope to Claim 4, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

26. With regard to Claim 16, MacInnis describes providing the same clock to the video display engine (58, Figure 2) and the encoder (62) (Col. 11, lines 59-64; Col. 34, lines 36-38; Col. 7, lines 20-25).

However, MacInnis does not teach that a multiplexer is used. However, Kim describes that a multiplexer (33, Figure 7) is used to provide clock signals (Col. 4, lines 44-53), as discussed in the rejection for Claim 12.

27. With regard to Claim 17, Claim 17 is similar in scope to Claim 6, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

28. Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacInnis (US006573905B1) and Kim (US006738417B1) in view of Van Hook (US006867781B1).

29. With regard to Claim 18, Claim 18 is similar in scope to Claim 7, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

30. With regard to Claim 19, MacInnis does not teach providing the same clock to the video display engine and the output interface. However, Van Hook describes providing a mechanism to synchronize the video display engine (114, Figure 4) and the output interface (164) (Col. 7, line 63-Col. 8, line 5), and therefore Van Hook inherently provides the same clock to the video display engine and the output interface, as discussed in the rejection for Claim 8.

However, MacInnis and Van Hook do not teach that a multiplexer is used. However, Kim describes that a multiplexer (33, Figure 7) is used to provide clock signals (Col. 4, lines 44-53), as discussed in the rejection for Claim 12.

31. Claims 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacInnis (US006573905B1) and Kim (US006738417B1) in view of Chih (US006535217B1).

32. With regard to Claim 18, Claim 18 is similar in scope to Claim 7, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

33. With regard to Claim 20, Claim 20 is similar in scope to Claim 9, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

34. Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacInnis (US006573905B1) and Kim (US006738417B1) in view of Christopher (US006900845B1).

35. With regard to Claim 21, Claim 21 is similar in scope to Claim 10, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

36. With regard to Claim 22, Claim 22 is similar in scope to Claim 11, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale.


***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joni Hsu whose telephone number is 571-272-7785. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ulka Chauhan can be reached on 571-272-7782. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JH



**Kee M. Tung**  
Primary Examiner